

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No.: 84.165A]

**Magnet Schools Assistance Program; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 1995**

*Purpose of Program* Provides grants to eligible local educational agencies and consortia of such agencies to support magnet schools that are part of approved desegregation plans.

*Eligible Applicants:* Local educational agencies (LEAs) and consortia of such agencies.

*Deadline for Transmittal of*

*Applications:* May 12, 1995.

*Deadline for Intergovernmental Review:* July 11, 1995.

*Applications Available:* March 20, 1995.

*Available Funds:* \$111,359,000.

*Estimated Range of Awards:* \$200,000–\$4,000,000.

*Estimated Average Size of Awards:* \$1,855,983.

*Estimated Number of Awards:* 60.

**Note:** The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

*Project Period:* Up to 36 months.

*Applicable Regulations:* (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 75 as published in the **Federal Register** on June 10, 1994 (59 FR 30258), 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85 and 86; and (b) the regulations in 34 CFR Part 280 as amended in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

**Priorities***Background*

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) makes grants to eligible LEAs and consortia of LEAs for programs that are designed to support—

- The elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in public elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group children;
- The development and implementation of magnet school projects that will assist in achieving systemic reform and providing all children the opportunity to meet challenging State content standards and challenging student performance standards;
- the development and design of innovative educational methods and practices; and
- courses of instruction within magnet schools that will substantially strengthen the knowledge of academic subjects and the grasp of tangible and marketable vocational skills of students attending those magnet schools.

*Competitive Priorities*

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i) and 34 CFR 280.32(b)-(f), the Secretary gives preference to applications that meet competitive priorities. Depending upon how well an application meets each priority, the Secretary awards additional points to the application for each priority up to the maximum number of points available for that priority. These points are in addition to any points the applicant earns under the selection criteria in 34 CFR 280.31.

The Secretary will award up to a total of 45 points for the following competitive priorities:

- *Need for assistance.* (15 points) The Secretary evaluates the applicant's need for assistance under this part, by considering—
  - (a) The costs of fully implementing the magnet schools project as proposed;
  - (b) The resources available to the applicant to carry out the project if funds under the program were not provided;
  - (c) The extent to which the costs of the project exceed the applicant's resources; and
  - (d) The difficulty of effectively carrying out the approved plan and the project for which assistance is sought, including consideration of how the design of the magnet school project—e.g., the type of program proposed, the location of the magnet school within the LEA—impacts on the applicant's ability to successfully carry out the approved plan.
- *New or revised magnet schools projects.* (10 points) The Secretary determines the extent to which the applicant proposes to carry out new magnet schools projects or significantly revise existing magnet schools projects.
- *Selection of students.* (10 points) The Secretary determines the extent to which the applicant proposes to select students to attend magnet schools by methods such as lottery, rather than through academic examination.
- *Innovative approaches and systemic reform.* (5 points) The Secretary determines the extent to which the project for which assistance is sought proposes to implement innovative educational approaches that are consistent with the State's and LEA's systemic reform plans, if any, under Title III of Goals 2000: Educate America Act.
- *Collaborative efforts.* (5 points) The Secretary determines the extent to which the project for which assistance is sought proposes to draw on comprehensive community involvement plans.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Applicants must submit with their

applications one of the following types of desegregation plans: (1) A plan required by a court order; (2) a plan required by a State agency or official of competent jurisdiction; (3) a plan required by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), United States Department of Education (ED), under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI plan); or (4) a voluntary plan adopted by the applicant.

Under the regulations, applicants are required to provide all of the information required under the regulations at § 280.20 (a)–(g) in order to satisfy the civil rights eligibility requirements found in § 280.2 (a)(2) and (b) of the regulations. In the past, if necessary, ED requested enrollment data or other information from applicants after their applications were submitted utilizing the procedures set forth in § 280.20(h). However, that follow-up process delayed awards under the program. In order to respond to requests from applicants and grantees that the Department announce MSAP awards earlier in the year, ED has modified the application review process for this competition.

Specifically, when conducting eligibility reviews of desegregation plans, under § 280.2 the Department will not follow up with applicants to obtain additional information or clarification. Accordingly, in order to satisfy the civil rights eligibility requirements found in § 280.2 (a)(2) and (b) of the regulations, it is very important that an applicant provide all of the information required under the regulations at § 280.20 (a)–(g). This notice describes that information.

In addition to the particular data and other items for required and voluntary plans, described separately in the information that follows, an application must include:

- Signed civil rights assurances (included in the application package);
- A copy of the applicant's desegregation plan; and
- An assurance that the plan is being implemented or will be implemented if the application is funded.

*Required Plans***1. Plans Required by a Court Order**

An applicant that submits a plan required by a court, State agency or official of competent jurisdiction, must submit complete and signed copies of all court or State documents demonstrating that the magnet schools are a part of the approved plan. Examples of the types of documents that would meet this requirement include—

- A Federal or State court order that establishes or amends a previous order

or orders by establishing additional or different specific magnet schools;

- A Federal or State court order that requires or approves the establishment of one or more unspecified magnet schools or that authorizes the inclusion of magnet schools at the discretion of the applicant.

## 2. Plans Required by a State Agency or Official of Competent Jurisdiction

An applicant submitting a plan ordered by a State agency or official of competent jurisdiction must provide documentation that shows that the plan was ordered based upon a determination that State law was violated. In the absence of this documentation, the applicant should consider its plan to be a voluntary plan and submit the data and information necessary for voluntary plans.

## 3. Title VI Required Plans

An applicant that submits a plan required by OCR under Title VI must submit a complete copy of the plan demonstrating that magnet schools are part of the approved plan.

## 4. Modifications to Required Plans

A previously approved desegregation plan that does not include the magnet school or program for which the applicant is now seeking assistance must be modified to include the magnet school component. The modification to the plan must be approved by the court, agency or official, that originally approved the plan. An applicant that wishes to modify a previously approved OCR Title VI plan to include different or additional magnet schools must submit the proposed modification for review and approval to the OCR Regional Office that approved its original plan.

An applicant should indicate in its application if it is seeking to modify its previously approved plan. However, all applicants must submit proof to ED of approval of all modifications to their plans by April 17, 1995.

### *Voluntary Plans*

A voluntary desegregation plan must be approved each time an application is submitted for funding. Even if ED has approved a voluntary desegregation plan in an LEA in the past, the plan must be resubmitted to ED for approval as part of the application.

An applicant submitting a voluntary desegregation plan must include in its application:

- A copy of a school board resolution or other evidence of final official action adopting and implementing the desegregation plan, or agreeing to adopt and implement the desegregation plan upon the award of assistance.
- Enrollment and other information as required by the regulations at § 280.20(f) and (g) for applicants with voluntary desegregation plans. Enrollment data and information are critical to ED's determination of an applicant's eligibility under a voluntary desegregation plan.

A voluntary desegregation plan is a plan to reduce, eliminate, or prevent minority group isolation (MGI), either at a magnet school or at a feeder school—a school from which students are drawn to attend the magnet school. Under § 280.2, the establishment of the magnet school cannot result in an increase in MGI at a magnet school or any feeder school above the districtwide percentage of minority group students at the grade levels served by the magnet school.

The following example and those in subsequent sections of this notice are designed to assist applicants in the preparation of their application. The examples illustrate the types of data and information that have proven successful in the past for satisfying the voluntary desegregation plan regulation requirements.

District A has a districtwide percentage of 65.5 percent for its minority student population in elementary schools. District A has six elementary schools with the following minority student populations:

1. School A—67 percent.
2. School B—58 percent.
3. School C—64 percent.
4. School D—76 percent.
5. School E—47 percent.
6. School F—81 percent.

District A has five minority group isolated schools, i.e., five schools with minority student enrollment of over 50 percent. District A seeks funding to establish a magnet program at School F to reduce MGI at that school. For District A to be eligible for a grant, the establishment of the magnet program at School F should not increase the minority student enrollment at feeder school C to more than 65.5 percent (the districtwide percentage). Also, the

establishment of the magnet program should not increase the minority student enrollment at feeder schools A or D at all because those schools are already above the districtwide percentage for minority students. If projected enrollments at a magnet or feeder school indicate that there will be an increase in MGI, District A should provide an explanation in its application for the increase that shows it is not caused by the establishment of the magnet program. See the discussion below.

An applicant that proposes to establish new magnet schools must submit projected data for each magnet and feeder school that show that the magnet schools and all feeders will maintain eligibility for the entire three-year period of the grant. Projected data are included in the examples below.

### **Objective: Reduction of Minority Group Isolation in Existing Magnet Schools**

In situations where the applicant intends to reduce minority isolation in an existing magnet program, whether in the magnet school or in one or more of the feeder schools, and minority isolation has increased, the applicant must provide data and information to demonstrate that the increase was not due to the applicant's magnet program, in accordance with § 280.20(g). See the following examples.

### **Options for Demonstrating Reduction**

#### **1. Magnet School Analysis**

District Z has two existing magnet high schools that began their magnet programs in different years. All of the other schools in the district are feeder schools to one or both of the magnet schools. District Z has six feeder schools and a districtwide minority enrollment of 59.95 percent. Since becoming a magnet school, Enterprise Magnet has increased its MGI from 74.40 percent to 76.55 percent. Because of this increase, this school would be found ineligible unless the increase in MGI was not caused by the magnet school. This may be shown through data indicating an increase either in minority enrollment districtwide or in the area served by the magnet school.

If District Z's districtwide minority enrollment has become more minority isolated due to districtwide demographic changes in the student population and if a magnet or a feeder school's increase in MGI is less than the districtwide increase in MGI, ED will conclude that the school's increase in MGI was not the result of the magnet programs, but due to the overall effect of demographic changes in the district as a whole.

District Z magnet school & base year	Base year					Current year					Increase in MGI
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Jefferson (1993) .....	459	349	76.03	110	23.97	514	356	69.26	158	30.74	.....
Enterprise (1991) .....	375	279	74.40	96	25.60	388	297	76.55	91	23.45	2.15%

**Note:** "Base Year" is the year prior to the year each school became a magnet.

Feeder school (ranked in order of descending minority enrollments)	Base year					Current year					Increase in MGI
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Rose .....	398	301	75.63	97	24.37	401	278	69.33	123	30.67	.....
Rocky Mount .....	289	199	68.86	90	31.14	291	211	72.51	80	27.49	3.65%
Wheeler .....	239	144	60.25	95	39.75	250	153	61.20	97	38.80	0.95%
King .....	289	144	49.83	145	50.17	277	149	53.79	128	46.21	.....
Tinker .....	451	211	46.78	240	53.22	423	221	52.25	202	47.75	.....
Holly .....	481	122	25.36	359	74.64	450	130	28.89	320	71.11	.....
Districtwide .....	2,981	1,749	58.67	1,232	41.33	2,994	1,795	59.95	1,199	40.05	1.28%

Projected magnet school & base year	1995-1996 Projected					1996-1997 Projected					1997-1998			
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Non-minority
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number
Jefferson (1993) .....	500	335	67	165	33	510	337	66	173	34	515	340	66	175
Enterprise (1991) .....	390	289	74	101	26	400	288	72	112	28	410	295	72	115

Feeder School	1995-1996 Projected					1996-1997 Projected					1997-1998 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Rose .....	400	272	68	128	32	400	272	68	128	32	400	264	66	136	34
Rocky Mount .....	300	210	70	90	30	300	210	70	90	30	300	204	68	96	32
Wheeler .....	250	148	59	102	41	250	148	59	102	41	250	148	59	103	41
King .....	280	151	54	129	46	280	151	54	129	46	280	151	54	129	46
Tinker .....	430	232	54	198	46	430	232	54	198	46	430	232	54	198	46
Holly .....	460	161	35	299	65	460	184	40	276	60	460	207	45	253	55
Districtwide .....	3,010	1,798	60	1,212	40	3,030	1,822	60	1,208	40	3,045	1,841	60	1,204	40

However, as with the magnet Enterprise, if the MGI in a magnet increases above the districtwide increase, an applicant must demonstrate that the magnet is not causing the problem. In order to show that the increase in MGI at a particular school is

not the result of the operation of a magnet, a district should provide student transfer data on the number of minority and nonminority students that attend the magnet program from the other feeder schools in the district for the current year. If, by subtracting from

the magnet enrollment those students that came from other schools, the MGI is higher than the districtwide average, it can be concluded that the increase in MGI was not caused by the magnet school.

Current year student transfer data for magnet schools that increase in minority group isolation over the districtwide minority enrollment.	Current year				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Enterprise .....	388	297	76.55	91	23.45
Students transferred to Jefferson to attend magnet program .....	25	4	.....	21	.....
Magnet school minority enrollment with transfer students "returned" to feeders. ....	363	293	80.72	70	19.28

Current year student transfer data for feeder schools that increase in minority group isolation over the districtwide minority enrollment.	Current year				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Rocky Mount .....	291	211	72.51	80	27.49
Students attending Jefferson .....	21	16	.....	5	.....
Students attending Enterprise .....	19	15	.....	4	.....
Feeder school minority enrollment with transfer students "returned" from magnet .....	331	242	73.11	89	26.89

## 2. Feeder School Analysis

In District Z, two feeder schools, Rocky Mount and Wheeler, increased in MGI by 3.65 percent and 0.95 percent respectively. Since Wheeler's MGI increase of 0.95 percent is less than the districtwide MGI increase of 1.28 percent, Wheeler's MGI increase was due to the demographic changes in the district and further scrutiny of Wheeler is not required.

Because Rocky Mount, a feeder school to magnet programs at Jefferson and Enterprise, increased in MGI over the districtwide average from 68.86 percent to 72.51 percent, this would make both Jefferson and Enterprise ineligible unless the district demonstrates that the increase was not because of the magnet programs. The clearest way for an applicant to show this is to provide student transfer data on the number of minority and nonminority students that left Rocky Mount to attend magnet programs at Jefferson and Enterprise. By adding the number of students that transferred to the magnet programs to Rocky Mount's total enrollment, ED can determine whether the increase was due to the magnet program. If it can be demonstrated that without the magnet

program, the MGI at the feeder school would be even higher, these magnet schools would be found eligible.

Some applicants may find it impossible to provide the type of student transfer data referred to above. In some cases, these applicants may be able to present demographic or other statistical data and information that would satisfy the requirements of the statute and regulations. This demographic data must persuasively demonstrate that the operation of a proposed magnet school would reduce, eliminate, or prevent minority group isolation in the applicant's magnet schools and would not result in an increase of MGI at one of the applicant's feeder schools above the districtwide percentage for minority students at the same grade levels as those served in the magnet school. (34 CFR § 280.20(g)). For example, an applicant might include data provided to it by a local social service agency about the numbers and concentration of families in a recent influx of immigrants into the neighborhood or attendance zone of the feeder school.

## 3. Additional Base-Year Data

If an applicant believes that comparing a magnet program's current-year enrollment data with its base year—i.e., the year prior to the year each school became a magnet or a feeder—enrollment data is misleading due to significant changes that have occurred in attendance zones or other factors affecting the magnet school or in the closing and combining of other schools with the magnet school, additional and more recent enrollment data for an alternative to the base year may be submitted along with a justification for its submission.

Objective: Conversion of an Existing School to a New Magnet Program

District X will convert Williams, an existing elementary school, to a new elementary magnet program. Currently, Williams has a minority enrollment of 94.67 percent. The district projects that the magnet program will reduce minority group isolation at Williams to 89 percent in the first year of the project. The projection of enrollment should be based upon reasonable assumptions and should clearly state the basis for these assumptions, e.g., parent or student interest surveys, or other objective indicators, such as waiting lists for other magnet schools in the district.

District X Magnet School	Current year					1995–1996 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority—	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Williams .....	450	426	94.67	24	5.33	450	400	89	50	11

Feeder School (Ranked in order of descending minority enrollments)	Current year					1995–1996 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority—		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Shaw .....	398	179	44.97	219	55.03	400	190	48	210	53
Lincoln .....	477	186	38.99	291	61.01	480	210	44	270	56
Districtwide .....	1,325	791	59.70	534	40.30	1,330	800	60	530	40

Magnet School	1996–1997 Projected					1997–1998 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority—		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Williams .....	450	392	87	59	13	450	383	85	67	15

Feeder School (Ranked in order of descending minority enrollments)	1996–1997 Projected					1997–1998 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority—		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Shaw .....	410	200	49	210	51	420	215	51	205	49
Lincoln .....	490	220	45	270	55	500	235	47	265	53
Districtwide .....	1,350	812	60	538	40	1,370	833	61	537	39

**Objective: Construction of New Magnet School/Reopening a Closed School**

District Y will construct a new school, Barton, and open its magnet program in 1996. There is no preexisting school, and consequently, it appears that no enrollment data are readily available to use as a

comparison. However, the district estimates that if the proposed magnet school had opened as a “neighborhood school,” without a magnet program designed to attract students from outside the “neighborhood” or attendance zone, it would have a minority enrollment of 67 percent. This estimate was based on national census data, supplemented

by more current data on the neighborhood provided by the local county government. The district further reasonably anticipates, based on surveys and other indicators, that when the new school opens as a magnet school in 1996, it will have a minority enrollment of 58 percent.

District Y Magnet School	Current year					1995–96 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority enrollment	Nonminority		Total percent	Minority Enrollment	Nonminority			
			Number	Percent			Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Barton .....	600	400	66.67	200	33.33	—	—	—	—	—

**Note:** Since this magnet will not open until 1996, the current year is the base year. Provide hypothetical base year data for what the school would look like if it had opened as a neighborhood school. For example, census data could be used to estimate the hypothetical enrollment.

Feeder School (ranked in order of descending minority enrollments)	Total Enrollment	Current year					1995–96 projected			
		Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Clark .....	298	101	33.89	197	66.11	—	—	—	—	—
Topper .....	324	111	34.26	213	65.74	—	—	—	—	—
Districtwide .....	1,222	612	50.08	610	49.92	—	—	—	—	—

Magnet School	1996–1997 Projected					1997–1998 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Barton .....	600	336	58	250	42	580	331	57	249	43

Feeder School (ranked in order of descending minority enrollments)	1996–97 Projected					1997–98 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Clark .....	300	125	42	175	58	310	136	44	174	56
Topper .....	330	135	41	195	59	340	146	43	194	57
Districtwide .....	1,230	610	50	620	50	1,230	613	50	617	50

**Objective: Reduction, Elimination, or Prevention of MGI at Targeted Feeder Schools**

Many applicants apply for MSAP funding to reduce, eliminate, or prevent minority

group isolation at a magnet school. However, some applicants have established magnet programs at schools that are not minority-isolated for the purpose of reducing, eliminating, or preventing minority isolation

at one or more targeted feeder schools. The data requirements and analysis for this type of magnet program are the same as described for “Existing Magnet Schools.” In this example, MGI is being reduced in each of the targeted feeder schools.

Magnet School	Base Year					Current Year				Nonminority
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total number	Percent	Minority		
		Percent	Number	Percent	Enrollment			Number	Percent	
Douglas .....	505	129	25.54	376	74.46	520	221	42.50	299	57.50

Feeder School (ranked in order of descending minority enrollments.)	Base year					Current year				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
North .....	398	309	77.64	89	22.36	401	275	68.58	126	31.42
Central .....	312	239	76.60	73	23.40	300	229	76.33	71	23.67
South .....	289	205	70.93	84	29.07	302	189	62.58	113	37.42
Districtwide .....	1,504	882	58.64	622	41.36	1,523	914	60.01	609	39.99

Magnet School	Total enrollment	1995-96 Projected					1996-97 Projected					1997-98 Projected			
		Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Douglas .....	520	234	45	286	55	525	247	47	278	53	530	276	52	254	48

Feeder School	1995–96 Projected					1996–97 Projected					1997–98 Projected				
	Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority		Total enrollment	Minority		Nonminority	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
North .....	410	275	67	135	33	410	267	65	143	35	410	258	63	152	37
Central .....	300	225	75	75	25	300	222	74	78	26	300	204	68	96	32
South .....	310	186	60	124	40	310	186	60	124	40	310	186	60	124	40
Districtwide .....	1,540	920	60	620	40	1,545	922	60	623	40	1,550	924	60	626	40

#### Objective: Prevention of Minority Group Isolation

An applicant that applies for MSAP funding for the purposes of preventing minority isolation must demonstrate that without the intervention of the magnet program, the magnet school or targeted feeder school will become minority-isolated within the project period. Generally this may be documented by showing a trend in the enrollment data for the proposed school. For example, if a neighborhood school currently has a 45 percent minority enrollment and, for the last three years, minority enrollment has increased an average of three percent each year (36 percent, 39 percent, and 42 percent), it is reasonable to expect that, in three years, the school would exceed 50 percent thereby becoming minority-isolated during the project period without the intervention of a magnet. The applicant in this example should submit this enrollment data in its application.

The preceding examples are not intended to be an exhaustive set of examples.

Applicants with questions about their desegregation plans and the information required in support of those desegregation plans (including applicants that find that these examples do not fit their circumstances and applicants who find that the enrollment data requested is unavailable or do not reflect accurately the effectiveness of their proposed magnet program) are encouraged to contact ED for technical assistance, prior to submitting their application by calling the contact person listed under the "FOR APPLICATIONS OR INFORMATION" heading.

#### FOR APPLICATIONS OR INFORMATION

**CONTACT:** Steven L. Brockhouse, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Portals Room 4509, Washington, DC 20202-6140. Telephone (202) 260-2476. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339

between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Information about the Department's funding opportunities, including copies of application notices for discretionary grant competitions, can be viewed on the Department's electronic bulletin board (ED Board), telephone (202) 260-9950; or on the Internet Gopher Server at GOPHER.ED.GOV (under Announcements, Bulletins, and Press Releases). However, the official application notice for a discretionary grant competition is the notice published in the **Federal Register**.

**Program Authority:** 20 U.S.C. 3021-3032.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

**Thomas W. Payzant,**

*Assistant Secretary, Elementary and Secondary Education.*

[FR Doc. 95-6708 Filed 3-17-95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**